

REMARKS

Applicants hereby request further consideration of the application in view of the amendments above and the comments that follow.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-59 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.71. Claims 1-4, 11-14, 20-22, 33-35, 40-41, 45-47 and 58 stand rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,185,295 to Goto et al. (Goto). Claims 1-5, 11-14, 20, 21, 33-35, 40, 41, 45, 46 and 58 stand rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,970,819 to Gates et al. (Gates). Claims 15, 16, 23, 32, 42-43, 48, 55 and 59 stand rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gates or Goto, as applied to Claims 1, 12, 14, 33, 41 and 48 above, and further in view of Han et al. (IEEE, 1994). The Action indicates that Claims 6-10, 17-19, 24-31, 36-39, 44, 49-55, 56 and 57 would be allowable if amended to overcome the objection under 37 CFR 1.71 and rewritten in independent form.

The Objection under 37 CFR 1.71

The claims have been amended as required by the Action. All of the claims now pending, including the new claims, include the recitation suggested by the Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

The Rejections under Sections 102 and 103

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

directing a beam of laser light at the substrate such that the beam of laser light is focused within the substrate between the first and second surfaces thereof

The Action contends that Gates and Goto each anticipate Claim 1. However, Applicants are unable to locate any teaching or suggestion in either Goto or Gates of directing a beam of laser light at a substrate such that the beam of laser light is focused within the substrate between first and second surfaces thereof. For example, the passage in Goto at col. 4, lines 26-34, merely describes a cutting depth, not the location of laser focus. Regarding Gates, it is

not apparent from the Action what disclosure of Gates is regarded as teaching or suggesting focusing of a laser light as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited art. Moreover, Applicants submit that the claimed invention would not have been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan in view of the cited art.

Claims 2-32 depend from Claim 1 as amended and are therefore allowable over the cited art for at least the foregoing reasons.

Applicants further note that the Action indicates that Claims 6-10, 17-19 and 24-31 are directed to allowable subject matter. In view of the foregoing comments, Applicants submit that it is not necessary to rewrite these allowed claims in independent form.

Claims 33-35 and 37-57 as Amended

The Action indicates that Claims 36, 44, 49 and 56 would be allowable if amended to overcome the objection under 37 CFR 1.71 and written in independent form. Claim 33 has been amended to include the recitations of original Claim 36. Claims 44 and 49 have been rewritten in independent form. Claim 56 remains in independent form. Each of Claims 33, 44, 49 and 56 has been amended to overcome the objection under 37 CFR 1.71. Each of Claims 34, 35, 37-43, 45-48, 50-55 and 57 depends from one of Claims 33, 44, 49 and 56. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 33-35 and 37-57 are now clearly in condition for allowance.

Claims 58-61

Claim 58 has been amended to recite "a fully ablated ablation trench defined in a surface of the substrate and extending along the break line," which recitation was included in allowed Claim 36. Claim 59 depends from Claim 58. New Claim 60 corresponds to original Claim 58, but further recites:

- c) at least one device layer on the first surface of the substrate, the at least one device layer including first and second device portions disposed on the first and second device regions, respectively; and

In re: Andrews et al.
Serial No.: 10/733,845
Filed: December 11, 2003
Page 15 of 15


d) an isolation trench in the at least one device layer,
the isolation trench defining a first mesa including the first device
portion and a second mesa including the second device portion;

These recitations were included in allowed Claim 44 and in Claim 40, from which Claim 44 depended. New Claim 61 corresponds to original Claim 58, but further recites "a shaping trench in the second side of the substrate," which recitation was included in allowed Claim 49. Each of Claims 58, 60 and 61 includes the recitation to overcome the objection under 37 CFR 1.71. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 58-61 are clearly in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is requested. Should the Examiner have any matters outstanding of resolution, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 919-854-1400 for expeditious handling.

Respectfully submitted,



David D. Beatty
Registration No. 38,071
Attorney for Applicants

USPTO Customer No. 20792
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: (919) 854-1400
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on
May 31, 2005 via facsimile number 571-273-1969.



Erin A. Campion